



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

TENNESSEE'S PLACE IN HISTORY.

Tennessee did not attain its majority until 1796 — more than a decade after the glorious revolution had been fought and won and the convention at Philadelphia had framed our present Constitution — but it illustrates some of the most striking chapters in the history of new world civilization. A Southern State, Tennessee's extraordinary career has lifted her out of the narrow confines of sectionalism to a position of national importance; and although unsettled until more than a century had elapsed since the building of Jamestown and the landing of the Pilgrims on the site of Plymouth Rock, Tennessee has played a role in the unfolding of American history unexcelled in importance by that played by the oldest of our commonwealths.

A part of that tract of land given by Queen Elizabeth to the ill-fated Raleigh and subsequently embraced within the imperial sweep of territory called Carolina, the region of country now comprising our State eventually fell to the lot of North Carolina when that colony and her Southern neighbor agreed upon a voluntary partition. At the time this division occurred, next to nothing was known of the vast domains on this side of the mountains; for the original population of our country was confined to the narrow strips of country fringing the Atlantic from Massachusetts to South Carolina. With the influx of immigration, however, and and in obedience to that roving spirit so characteristic of the race, the population soon began to roll from the seaboard in the direction of the interior and west. Not only was Georgia settled; but in almost all of the States the hill-country became occupied, while local peculiarities — reflected in speech and custom — often marked successive waves of population as the tide swept westward. All went well enough until the great Appalachian chain was reached. These mountains constituted our Rubicon. Must we cross them

or not? To remain within the narrow limits of the original thirteen States meant the death of every hope looking towards continental supremacy, while to press onward was to follow the stars in their course. Race instinct rather than deliberate choice decided the question. The barriers set by nature in the pathway of the pioneer were brushed aside, and a region declared by DeTocqueville to be the most magnificent dwelling place designed by God for the abode of man was thrown open to occupation and settlement. Tennessee, it seems to me, did as much, if not indeed more, for this colonial policy of the United States than any of her sister commonwealths. This, moreover, was every whit as much the result of the character of her population as of her geographical situation. For while it is true that her ribbon-like shape, tying as it does the Mississippi to the East, has enabled this State to exert a potent influence upon some eight or ten neighboring commonwealths, it is to the bold pioneers who blazed the way for civilization in the wilderness that are to be attributed those dashing qualities found in their descendants. Accordingly when we come to examine a little into the budding process by which the institutions of enlightenment have been engrafted upon the western country, we at once begin to appreciate Tennessee's share in that great work and at the same time to realize that so far from never having had a foreign policy, our government has been one of the most extensive and original colonizers this world has ever seen.

Now everybody has a pretty clear idea of what a colony represents as well as the manner in which the colonial systems of ancient and modern times have carried the arts, commerce, government and the thousand and one other accessories of civilization to all inhabitable portions of the globe. Naturally enough, in this case the narrow limits of the region first occupied, and added to that the adventurous spirit inherent in the English-speaking people, impelled the westward movement I have already referred to, and caused numerous communities to spring up at an early day on the

western side of the mountains. It is true no seas were crossed as was the case with those torrents of population which filled up the waste places of the old world in the dawn of history. Yet these settlers of the western wilderness were colonists in every sense of the word ; and I press this point because we are sometimes apt to forget the true significance of this phase of our country's development which after all was merely a continuation of that wandering of people which has been going on for thousands of years. When, moreover, we consider the growth of these western colonies and the manner in which the nation has regulated their relations with the government at Washington, the phenomenal territorial expansion of the United States becomes far easier of comprehension.

As far as our own State is concerned it was perhaps the treaty of Fort Staurix which threw open to immigration the beautiful region along the Watauga ; and right here is perhaps the real starting point of Tennessee history, while the Watauga Association — that remarkably independent body with its code of self-imposed laws — furnishes to American history one of its most interesting chapters. Fired with that sentiment of bold independence which was born of the free air of the forest, it only required those fresh accessions of men who had been driven out of North Carolina by Governor Tryon's tyranny, to kindle into a blaze the smoldering embers of popular resistance to greed and usurpation. And although at this late day we can do little more than speculate on what might have been the outcome of the plan to erect the Watauga people into a permanently autonomous community, still this short-lived association furnishes us with one of the earliest, if not indeed the very earliest example of a free and self-governed English-speaking colony in America. Had the dream of permanent local independence which came to some of those brave and hardy pioneers as they smoked their pipes on the banks of the Holston been realized, the subsequent history, not only of this region but of the entire west, might have been altogether different. Cut off from

all connection with the east, the Watauga people might have had one of several easily conceivable fates. Possibly the ties of blood may have drawn them towards their kinsmen by the sea, or caught in the cunningly devised traps so often set for them by European snarers they may have been alienated forever from the rest of the country. What is more probable still, they may have shared the fate of their forerunners under Raleigh and been destroyed by the stealthy blow of the tomahawk. Fortunately, however, both for them and for mankind the experiment was not for long put to the test. For in spite of the baffling questions relating to real estate titles—owing to the mistaken impression on the part of many of the settlers that they were in Virginia—all went well in the end, when the land was given to North Carolina. The full significance of that decision should not be lost sight of. Above everything else it meant that the future of this region was to be largely in the keeping of those who had pitched their tents here. Had the decision been otherwise, Virginia, then the leading commonwealth of America, would in all likelihood either have constituted it a part of Kentucky or erected it into one or more counties of the Valley of Virginia type. Falling as it did, however, to the more democratic although weaker State of North Carolina, the stretch of territory now called Tennessee, was at first left to its own devices which is but another way of saying that the future would bring to it a freedom and greatness never dreamed of by the side of Watauga. In the whole character of the country, moreover, there was everything to quicken the ambition of the least enthusiastic pioneer and set him to building castles in Spain. Before him was a soil of almost matchless fertility, well-adapted by reason of gradations of altitude to an almost endless variety of crops, not to mention timber in abundance and mineral resources of untold wealth. Noble rivers, too, bespoke a future commerce at a time when men had not even thought of the steamboat and locomotive, which in later times were to revolutionize the whole world.

Now these same natural waterways facilitated the settlement of the country and linked its various sections with one another and with the rest of the nation. Nor need I in this connection do more than remind you of how the various rivers and mountains of our nascent commonwealth stamped its history with a characteristic peculiarly its own, nor how, while the groups of log cabins were fast filling the hills and valleys of what is now known as East Tennessee, James Robertson and his sturdy companions were making their way towards the Cumberland region, where they were destined to lay the foundations of what we at present call Middle Tennessee. Years afterwards, particularly after the tribe of the Chickasaws had been extinguished in 1818, West Tennessee emerged from the tangled canebrakes of the Mississippi and the clover leaf became complete.

It would be a great mistake to fancy that the occupation and settlement of this great region was a task slightly performed or void of those thrilling episodes always found in the struggles of civilized man with the terrible forces of nature. Here, as elsewhere, the conflict was a severe one. Even after the trees had been felled, the cabins built, the swamps reclaimed, and the wild beasts destroyed, there stood in every path of the settlers a foe whose ruthless deeds of rapine and bloodshed entitle him in every respect to the name of red man. We shall accordingly find that under a sense of common danger and isolation, the power of the individual was magnified greatly. Hence there was developed here, as has always been the case under like circumstances, that loyal devotion to some strong chieftain or leader which more or less tinges our entire political history. Herein, I think, lies the secret of much of the influence and success of men like Sevier, Blount, Shelby, Robertson, and others of the heroic period of our history ; of Carroll, Houston, Jackson, Polk, Campbell, and others of what might be called the middle period, and of men of our own period whose names will at once suggest themselves to all of you. In the case of the earliest leaders, moreover, there were further circum-

stances which were especially calculated to thrust them to the front; for while the settlers of the original thirteen States often had the protection of the crown to shield them from savage atrocities, the men who first peopled Tennessee were usually obliged to rely almost entirely upon the principles of self-help. Add to this the additional fact that they were Celtic rather than Anglo-Saxon in their origin, and we can more readily understand the rise of a system possessing many of the features of Scottish clans.

As we all know, the fact that the early settlers of the State were compelled to defend themselves almost single-handed against the savage of the wilderness and the outlaw of the pale face communities, did much to wean them from the North Carolina government; and our local historians like Heyward, Ramsey, and Phelan, as well as Mr. Roosevelt and other writers from a distance, all agree in attaching much importance to this fact when they endeavor to explain the rise and fall of the so-called State of Franklin. The growing dissatisfaction with the attitude of the parent State was therefore not so remarkable after all; for in spite of the fact that it was the lusty soldiery of Watauga who had saved the day at King's Mountain, North Carolina often appeared weary of the demands for protection which the back-country people made upon her. Fancy, then, the indignation of the latter when in 1784, North Carolina, now heavily in debt, suddenly remembered her western possessions and conveyed them, on certain conditions, to the general government. As it turned out the grant was not then accepted; but smarting under real or fancied grievances, is it to be wondered at that the people on this side of the Alleghanies regarded themselves as absolved from further allegiance to a parent who had consistently ignored them? But while it is quite natural that the settlers should have resented North Carolina's rather cavalier treatment, still it is fortunate that the men who met at Jonesboro and created the government named in honor of the great philosopher of Pennsylvania, were eventually defeated by the adherents to North Caro-

lina's claims. For although the separation was aimed at the parent State only, it might in the end have extended a great deal further. And that those who opposed the various separatist tendencies noticeable throughout the country shortly after the successful termination of the war for independence, were keenly alive to the dangers of the situation is a very apparent fact in our history. Even Franklin himself, in whose honor the recalcitrant counties had named their incipient State, exercised great caution in the matter. The correspondence which took place between him and the representatives of the Franklin government is full of interest to the students of Tennessee history. This is the letter sent to Franklin by William Cocke, with Franklin's reply two months later :

STATE OF FRANKLIN,
15 June, 1786.

SIR.—I make no doubt but you have heard that the good people of this country have declared themselves a separate State from North Carolina ; and that, as a testimony of the high esteem they have for the many important and faithful services you have rendered to your country, they have called the name of their State after you. I presume you have also heard the reasons on which our separation is founded, some of which are as follows : that North Carolina had granted us a separation on certain well-known conditions expressed in an act of the General Assembly of that State, which conditions, we think, she had no right to break through without our consent, as well as the consent of Congress. We therefore determine strictly to adhere to the conditions expressed in said Act, and doubt not but Congress will be uniform in their just demands, as well as honorable in complying with their resolve to confirm all the just claims of such persons, as have purchased land under the laws of North Carolina, for which they have paid that State.

The confidence we have in the wisdom and justice of the United States inclines us to leave every matter of dispute to their decision, and I am expressly empowered and commanded to give the United States full assurance, that we shall act in obedience to their determination, provided North Carolina will consent that

they shall become the arbiters. I had set out with the intention to wait on Congress to discharge the duties of the trust reposed in me, but I am informed, that Congress will adjourn about the last of this month; and I will thank you to be so kind as to favor me with a few lines by the bearer, Mr. Rogers, to inform me when Congress will meet again, and shall be happy to have your sentiments and advice on so important a subject.

I have the honor to be, &c.,

WILLIAM COCKE.

[Letter to B. Franklin — Works of Franklin, edited by Sparks, Vol. X., pp. 260-261, 1840.]

PHILADELPHIA, 12 August, 1786.

SIR.—I received yesterday the letter you did me the honor of writing me on the 15th of June past. I had never before been acquainted, that the name of your intended new State had any relation with my name, having understood that it was called *Frankland*. It is a very great honor indeed, that its inhabitants have done me, and I should be happy if it were in my power to show how sensible I am of it, by something more essential than my wishes for their prosperity.

Having resided some years past in Europe, and being but lately arrived thence, I have not had an opportunity of being well informed of the points in dispute between you and the State of North Carolina. I can therefore only say, that I think you are perfectly right in resolving to submit them to the discretion of Congress, and to abide by their determination. It is a wise and impartial tribunal, which can have no sinister views to warp its judgment. It is happy for us all, that we have now in our own country such a council to apply to, for composing our differences, without being obliged, as formerly, to carry them across the ocean to be decided, at an immense expense, by a council which knew little of our affairs, would hardly take any pains to understand them, and which often treated our applications with contempt, and rejected them with injurious language. Let us, therefore, cherish and respect our own tribunal; for the more generally it is held in high regard, the more able it will be to answer effectually the ends of its institution, the quieting of our contentions, and thereby promoting our common peace and happiness.

I do not hear any talk of an adjournment of Congress, concerning which you inquire; and I rather think it likely they may continue to sit out their year, as it is but lately they have been able to make a quorum for business, which must therefore probably be in arrears.

If you proceed in your intended journey, I shall be glad to see you as you pass through Philadelphia.

In the meantime I have the honor to be, very respectfully, Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

B. FRANKLIN.

[To WILLIAM COCKE. Ibid. 266-67.]

To understand the significance of the attitude assumed by the early settlers of Tennessee in the Franklin dispute, it will be necessary to recur once more to the subject of our constitutional and territorial expansion. At the close of the war of the revolution the States found themselves with a loose government and confronted with questions whose solution required the strong arm of a central authority. Without an executive and without a judiciary, the general government was vested in a congress which had the right to pass laws but no means of enforcing them. All the fruits of the recent struggle seemed about to slip from the hands of the victorious patriots. Despised abroad as a weak upstart to be bullied and insulted on sea and land, the United States government was scarcely more respected at home. In almost every State the forces of anarchy appeared ready to overturn the fabric of society, already tottering from top to bottom on account of the weak bonds of the Confederation. Jealousies between the States, domestic violence, loss of interest in the general government, and countless other evils enforced upon those who loved their country, the wholesome lesson that if Valley Forge and Bunker Hill and Yorktown and Camden and the numerous other days and years of suffering and bloodshed meant anything at all they meant that the bond of States must be welded into a bonded State if free government was to be maintained on this continent. Therefore the convention which met at Philadel-

phia in 1787 to improve matters suggested our present form of government, which was shortly afterwards acquiesced in by the States and set in operation. From the outset there was the question of the West; and although few realized the boundless possibilities of the imperial regions along the Mississippi, the clear genius of Washington taught him that this vast stretch of country must come into the possession of the nation he so nobly loved and served. At that time several of the States, notably New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia and North Carolina, had vague claims to the western country. As we all know, the war had left all of the States heavily in debt, while a vicious system of paper money had shaken public confidence in the credit of the State governments. Under these circumstances, the proposition of the United States to assume those debts in return for the western country was acceded to; and henceforth the separatist tendencies were to be directed, if directed at all, against the general government rather than against the government of any particular State. But even after our national government had acquired the titles of the States to the western country all was by no means plain sailing. The aborigines, now thoroughly aroused, became restless and dangerous, while France, Spain and Great Britain, then the leading powers of Christendom, had their possessions in the west and viewed with no friendly eyes the advancing host of American settlers. France and Spain appear to have been particularly desirous of securing the region now embraced within the limits of our State, and many were the tempting bribes offered various western leaders. Representatives of both Spain and France, moreover, had early explored portions of the present State of Tennessee, and it is a well-known fact that on the Chickasaw Bluffs was erected one of those forts which stretched like a long chain from Canada to Louisiana, and were designed for the double purpose of uniting the northern and the southern possessions of France and checking the westward movement of the rifle-bearing American pioneer. The Frenchman not only,

but the Spaniard also, saw in the erection of an independent English-speaking State in the West a barrier between the great republic of the North and the Latin empires of the Southwest. In spite, however, of the fact that here and there a leading man yielded to the seductive blandishments of our country's enemies, the bulk of the western population remained true to the rest of the country, and later on, when the British had withdrawn from the lake country, the Americans were in almost undisputed possession of the country east of the Mississippi. And there was yet a fourth power that disputed the occupancy of this region,—the native red man; and then Cherokees, Creeks, and Chickasaws, with their numerous tribal divisions, undertook with all the fierceness of savages, encouraged with European money and arms, to wrest this land from those who had won it. I agree, moreover, with those who maintain that the Indian's title to this country was not a whit better, if indeed as good, as that of the white man's. Mr. Roosevelt, it seems to me, has more clearly than any other writer vindicated the pioneer and the settler from those charges of robbery and murder which a too maudlin sentimentality is often liable to bring against them. Referring to this very subject of the extermination of the native red man, Mr. Roosevelt says: "In its results, and viewed from the standpoint of applied ethics, the conquest and settlement by the whites of the Indian lands was necessary to the greatness of the race and to the welfare of civilized man. It was as ultimately beneficial as it was inevitable. Huge tomes might be filled with arguments as to the morality or immorality of such conquests. But these arguments appeal chiefly to the cultivated men in highly civilized communities who have neither the wish nor the power to lead warlike expeditions into savage lands. Such conquests are commonly undertaken by those reckless and daring adventurers who shape and guide each race's territorial growth. They are sure to come when a masterful people, still in its raw barbarian prime, finds itself face to face with a weaker and

wholly alien race which holds a coveted prize in its feeble grasp. . . . All that can be asked is that they shall be judged as other wilderness conquerors, as other slayers and quellers of savage peoples are judged. The same standards must be applied to Sevier and his hard-faced horse-riflemen that we apply to the Greek colonists of Sicily and the Roman colonists of the valley of the Po; to the Cossack rough rider who won for Russia the vast and melancholy Siberian steppes, and to the Boer who guided his ox-drawn wagon trains to the hot grazing lands of the Transvaal; to the founders of Massachusetts and Virginia, of Oregon and icy Saskatchewan; and to the men who built up those far-off commonwealths whose coasts are lapped by the waters of the great South Sea."

It is true the frontiersman may have often been cruel and that the wigwam of many a peaceably-inclined Indian may have gone up in smoke without sufficient provocation; but if cruel blows were struck more ruthless ones were received, and they were all the more ruthless and cruel since they came when least expected. Frequently when all was quiet and the settler was seated peacefully in his cabin there burst upon his ear that yell which never failed to blanch the cheek of the roughest woodsman and which was never silenced until the Nickajack expedition crushed forever the savage power in this region. Meanwhile the rush towards the west continued, for those who had been ruined by the war hoped to find in a new country opportunities for bettering their impoverished condition. But whether the settler came as a broken soldier of the revolutionary war to take up land granted him by the State or the Federal government, or whether he was driven into the wilderness by reason of that love of adventure so characteristic of the times, the result was everywhere the same. From the mountains to the Mississippi there stretched a more or less sparsely settled territory inhabited by a lusty, independent and buoyant population. And yet we could not say that it was an Anglo-Saxon population who won for the cause of civilization this

magnificent domain. On the contrary it would be nearer the mark to say the Scotch-Irish constituted the bulk of the population. In this respect, therefore, the settlement of Tennessee perhaps differs from that of any other State in the Union, unless it be Kentucky. New England, for example, and the States she settled were notably Anglo-Saxon, while Virginia and South Carolina reproduced many of the features characteristic of the old English squirearchy. But the men who crossed the Alleghanies and made their way by water and over Indian trail to the western country represented a stock whose history is yet to be written. Presbyterian, for the most part, in their religious faith, and often lovers of learning, they carried with them to the wilderness both religious and mental training. Schools, for example, like the one which subsequently grew into the university at Knoxville or the one which grew into the University of Nashville are entitled to a high place in the history of new world education.

The events which followed the influx of settlers have been briefly alluded to. The so-called State of Franklin, succumbing to the inevitable the year after the constitutional convention had convened at Philadelphia, the general government in 1790 acquired from North Carolina all of that State's land lying on this side of the mountains. Congress had already had some experience in dealing with the western country and the instrument known as the Ordinance of 1787 became the organic law of the northwestern territory. It was in all likelihood this part that led North Carolina to insert in her act of cession a clause protecting the slave-owner's interests in the region parted with by her. And insignificant as this part may have appeared at the time, this clause was destined to exert a potent influence, for it not only fastened upon the inchoate State of Tennessee the institution of domestic servitude, but also projected the sectional line in a westernly direction. While, therefore, subsequent events were to witness the rise of a free northwest, they were also to witness the rise of a southwest with slavery.

As a territory, this region, under the protecting care of the national government, enjoyed six years of phenomenal activity and growth, which would probably have been even greater had not the parent State retained the right to dispose of lands to her unpaid soldiers. This gave rise to serious complications even after the tripartite arrangement between North Carolina, Tennessee, and the United States. But without anticipating, I need only remind you of the fact that when the lusty young territory knocked for admission at the doors of Congress the opposition to her promotion to statehood was formidable. For, democratic in ideas and principles, the territory was not looked upon with very friendly eyes by the federalist, who saw nothing but a few more votes for Jefferson in the ambitious and growing territory. In spite, however, of more or less technical objections based on the manner in which the census of the territory had been taken — the enumeration having been made by the local authorities rather than by federal officers — Washington, as early as April 8, 1796, transmitted the facts in the case to Congress, which, with the approval of the President, duly admitted the territory into the Union, June 1, 1796.

Named in honor of one of its counties, which had taken the name of the great river that twice crosses her territory, Tennessee now became a member of the republic. Tennessee represents the first mile-stone in the march of civilization across the continent; and if we are proud of the part the Watauga people played in our great revolution, we have no less reason to be proud that she furnishes the first example of that so-called budding process which has formed so marked a feature of the American colonial policy. No Grecian or Roman government, not even so free a country as England is to-day, has ever raised a single one of its colonies to a level with the oldest portion of the mother country. Thus were the dreams of future greatness realized when Tennessee found herself a member of the Union; and thus also had men already realized that State colonies were in

the very nature of things doomed to hopeless failure. As a commonwealth, Tennessee's one hundred years of growth and usefulness form part of our national history. From what has been already said, and from what you already know, I need scarcely say that the leading characteristics of our first constitution were its democratic spirit and tendencies. And that these elements were decided innovations in American history, is a fact often lost sight of when one begins to reckon up the forces that have silently contributed towards the evolution of government by the multitude in the New World. The Federalists were still strong, although men viewed them somewhat suspiciously after the passage of the Alien and Sedition Laws. Jefferson, who is credited with the opinion that our first constitution was the most democratic in existence, had not yet attained the prestige that finally landed him in the White House, the darling of an inchoate democracy. The excesses of the red republicans of France had had a tendency to create a sort of conservative reaction just as liberal ideas were leavening the whole world. In all of the other States of the Union, moreover, there were various restrictions upon the suffrage as well as upon office-holding, and many positions of public trust now filled by popular vote were then filled by the appointing power. What democracy did exist was of a local rather than a national type. For the nation itself was far from being a democracy. Not an officer under the new federal government was elected by the people. Accordingly when Tennessee's first constitution swept away many of the restrictions upon popular government that obtained in the older portions of the Union, she took a new path; and if she did not found a democracy, she certainly gave it an impulse it had never before enjoyed. Slavery, however, was tacitly recognized. It was this constitution which remained our organic law until 1834 when a new one was adopted for the purpose of curing evils partly inherent in the original instrument of 1796 and partly the result of the evolution of new ideas. Nor is it necessary to remind you of the fact that the almost four decades

that separate the first constitution from the second were years bristling with stirring events. It was the period which witnessed the final triumph of the white man over the red in all the country east of the Mississippi; the purchase of Louisiana; the opening of the great Father of Waters to American commerce; the war of 1812; the bank controversy, and an early financial crisis, in all of which events Tennessee played her rôle. It was, moreover, a period especially noted for great men,—men of marked courage and ability—who by their wisdom and strength of character laid the foundations of Tennessee's greatness. In the catalogue of those early leaders one would not think of omitting the names of John Sevier, the Shelbys, Joseph McMinn, William Carroll or Samuel Houston. Least of all could one forget the name of him who overtops them all, the Sage of the Hermitage, Andrew Jackson, who may indeed be said to be the embodiment of Tennessee history. For what Miles Standish is to New England and Captain John Smith to Virginia, Andrew Jackson is not only to Tennessee but to all the western country. Indeed, he is something more than this,—he may be said to typify the American democracy of some half century ago more than any man has done either before or since. Like the State he so long and bravely served, Jackson was born under adverse circumstances, struggled manfully against the most discouraging environments which he finally victoriously overcame to rise to a position of national importance. Taking with him to Washington the lessons he had learned in Tennessee, Jackson nationalized democracy, and whether threatening the bank, or denouncing the Nullifiers, or championing any other cause he thought to be right, Andrew Jackson was acting in obedience to impulses he for the most part received in the State that largely made him what he was. I dwell at some length on this branch of my subject, but not as long as I should like to do; for it seems to me that Jackson's administration—or reign as some are disposed to call it—was one of the most significant chapters in our State as

well as in our national history. Bringing Tennessee into special prominence, it kept her before the eyes of the world and gave her a political importance she maintained down to the beginning of the war of secession. Of course, however, she did not owe that preëminence entirely to one man or set of men. I have, moreover, already drawn attention to her peculiar geographical position, a fact often commented on, which links her on the one side almost to the seaboard and on the other to the Mississippi, while her long rhomboidal shape throws her into more or less intimate relations with a number of other States. This will be more readily discerned by glancing at a map of our country and observing Tennessee's proximity to Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, Kentucky, Illinois, and Indiana. It was this fact, together with the temper of her population, that made Tennessee a great colonizer and poured from her limits a stream of population into regions which would have been impossible of settlement but for the occupation and civilization of this State. It was a Tennessean whose bravery at the Alamo won the admiration of all the world ; another Tennessean beat back Santa Anna's forces at San Jacinto and made Texan independence possible, and while for a second time a Tennessean was President, our war with Mexico occurred ; of which, without endeavoring to justify all its features, this much may be said : that it is well for us that California and the Pacific coast generally are in our possession.

One who undertakes to tell the story of Tennessee during the war must bear in mind her entire social and political history. He will perceive, moreover, that with the growth of new ideas there came a great change in the political sentiment of the people,—a change partly but not entirely attributable to the Jackson-Van Buren-White controversy, and which it is at times difficult either to describe or explain. The people had not grown less democratic, but a diversity of interests gave rise to differences of opinion and

public sentiment became more evenly divided. The old leaders, moreover, began to drop off one by one and new men, born of the new times, came to take their places. The Whig party, strengthened by recruits from various disaffected elements, came rapidly to the front, frequently dislodging the ancient democratic organization from its hereditary positions of trust and emolument. But the Whigs do not appear, in local matters certainly, to have possessed the entire confidence of the people any more than did the Democrats, although partisanship had the unfortunate tendency to become sectional. It would perhaps be not far from the mark to accept the geographical distribution of parties given by the late Professor Johnston, of Princeton, and say that in the period immediately preceding the war East Tennessee was strongly Whig, Middle Tennessee strongly Democratic, and West Tennessee pretty evenly divided between the two parties—the advantage being possibly on the side of the Democrats. The electoral vote of the State was often cast for the Whig candidate until that party's dissolution gave rise to the so-called American party. Under these circumstances, therefore, we should not be surprised to find that when the question of secession arose there was an opposition scarcely exceeded by that encountered by the movement in any other Southern State. Tennessee had always been firmly attached to the Union. In every war the Volunteer State had served the national government bravely and well. In peace Tennessee had been no less active; and in addition to the two Presidents she had up to then given the country, she had furnished the nation many other useful men. Among them, Campbell had been Secretary of the Treasury and Minister to Russia; Eaton had held the portfolio of War; Felix Grundy had been Attorney General; while both Johnson and Brown had been Postmaster General. In addition, moreover, to the services of men like these, others had served the country in numerous ways. Boone had blazed the way for the settlers of Kentucky, while Crockett and Houston had shed additional lustre on the glory of the State

by the magnificent services they rendered the Texans in their struggle with Mexican despotism. But blood proved stronger than water, for while East Tennessee may not, on the whole, have had much in common with what we usually comprehend by the expression, the South, ties of kinship and supposed interest bound Middle and West Tennessee very closely to that section; and whatever we may now think of Tennessee's decision to cast in her lot with that of the Confederacy, we can understand the position a majority of her citizens appear to have assumed. We can do even more than this. Tennessee foresaw that should she turn her face southward she would become the theatre of many a hardfought battle which could not fail to bring to her population unnumbered woes; accordingly we cannot fail to admire and honor her devotion to what she believed to be right. At the same time many of her citizens followed their own convictions and fought under the old flag just as bravely as their brethren were contending under the new. Both fought as no other men could fight, for both were Americans. But it was written in the Book of Fate that this fairest region of the new world should be the home of one nation and one only; and loving as we do the men who fought for the Confederacy, we cannot, in the light of the present, regret their want of success; although we may be better able to think that way now than directly after the war; for here as in other parts of the South, there for a time existed after the conclusion of hostilities, a state of things that at times became almost unbearable. Perhaps it was not as bad in Tennessee as it was further South, although this may in a measure be attributed to the division of public sentiment in the State and to the further fact that for a third time in the history of our country a Tennessean resided in the White House. Our State, therefore, escaped many of the objectionable features of military rule as well as the more rigorous measures of reconstruction, while the large union element caused the creation of a civil government here earlier than in the other Southern States. The late Judge Reese,

moreover, has brought out the further fact that Tennessee freed her own slaves, and this fact, as he explains, was owing to the clause in North Carolina's act of cession by which it was stipulated that Congress should make no regulations tending to emancipate the slaves of settlers in Tennessee. Subsequent history is within the memory of men still living. The great question regarding the State debt; the removal of the illiberal iron-clad oath, and the eventual establishment of a more satisfactory local government are facts which I need do no more than mention. Of no less interest, too, are some of the results born of a more settled order of affairs. How the hidden resources of our State suddenly acquired world-wide renown; how the sudden influx of immigrants brought to the commonwealth the capital and labor necessary to develop it; how our towns and cities took on new life and saw a phenomenal growth; and how increased wealth fostered the growth of that interest in education now so noticeable on all sides—these are facts which must fill the mind of every Tennessean with hope and enthusiasm respecting the future.

And now in conclusion, we have seen how a wilderness forming part of various extensive regions granted favorites of English royalty was finally settled by a race of hardy frontiersmen, who brought with them the religion, the habits of frugality and industry, the love of learning and truth, and the sturdy strength of character which enter into the personality of every Scotch-Irishman; and that these were followed by others who came, later on, and possessing more of the wealth and learning of the older States. We have seen that if Massachusetts and Virginia are English; New York, Dutch; and Louisiana, French; none the less is Tennessee Celtic; but that so far from being less American, Tennessee has ever been one of the most American of our commonwealths. We have seen that in every war, including that of the great revolution, the blood of Tennesseans has been shed freely in defense of our freedom and honor, that the work of her settlers, combined with the vigorous

activity of the newly-created nation, drove out the savage and at the same time prevented this great region from falling into the hands of one or more European powers. We have seen, too, how the democratic spirit of her people, born of the free air of the wilderness, strengthened the cause of popular government throughout the land and that in the person of Andrew Jackson this spirit became incarnated. We have seen, again, how restless adventurers and hunters pushed far afield, opened up the west and southwest, and helped forward the work of territorial expansion which acquired still greater impulse from the accession of Texas and the conquest of Mexico in both of which events Tennessee played a conspicuous part. We have furthermore seen that during and immediately after the close of the war of secession, Tennessee not only occupied an anomalous position, but witnessed events of the greatest national significance. With the exception of Virginia, more soldiers were stricken down on her soil than on that of any other State. A great tragedy elevated one of her sons to the presidency, and the relations between this third Tennessean President and Congress at times assumed threatening proportions. Freeing her own slaves, we have seen that Tennessee was the first of the Southern States to be restored to their rights under the Constitution. The history of such a State is something more than of either local or national importance. It constitutes a chapter in the history of civilization itself.

B. J. RAMAGE.